

REMARKS

Claims 26, 28, 34, 35, and 41 have been amended, claims 27, 32, 40, 45, 47 and 48 have been cancelled without prejudice, and claim 49 has been added. No new matter has been added by virtue of the amendments. For instance, support for the amendments appears e.g. in the original claims of the application.

Claims 26-30, 32, 34-43 and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Lee et al. (U.S. Patent 6,200,731) and further in view of Takeda et al. (U.S. Patent 6,156,481).

Claims 47-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Lee et al. (U.S. Patent 6,200,731) and in view of Takeda et al. (U.S. Patent 6,156,481) and further in view of Varinsi et al. (U.S. Patent 6,140,015).

For the sake of brevity, the two rejections are addressed in combination. Each of the rejections is traversed.

All of the pending claims call for a photoresist that comprises a polymer that is substantially free of aromatic groups and comprises 1) units crosslinked to other polymer units and 2) photoacid-labile acrylate groups.

The cited documents clearly do not suggest such photoresists as Applicants claim.

Among other things, the primary citation of Lee et al. does not suggest use of a polymer that contains acrylate units of any kind, much less photoacid-labile acrylate groups. Rather, Lee reports certain polymers that are formed by co-polymerization of norbonyl monomers and maleic anhydride monomers. See, for instance, Lee et al. at column 3, line 60 through column 4, line

57. Lee et al. does not suggest in any respect that acrylate units should be attempted to be employed as a further polymer group.

The addition of the Takeda et al. document does not remedy such deficiencies of Lee et al.

Thus, for instance, Takeda is specifically directed to entirely different polymers that comprise phenolic units.

Moreover, the stated objected and benefits of the Lee et al. system and the Takeda et al. system are clearly distinct, further indicating that the skilled worker would not look to incorporate selected features of the Takeda et al. system into the Lee et al. system, as has been proposed by the instant rejection. In this regard, attention is directed to Lee et al. at column 4, line 49 through column 5, line 22 and Takeda et al. at column 2.

In view thereof, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are requested.

It is believed the application is in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter F. Corless (Reg. No. 38,360)
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP
P.O. Box 9169
Boston, MA 02209
Tel: (617) 439-4444
Fax: (617) 439-4170